

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF ALASKA**

JAG Alaska, Inc.,

Plaintiff,

v.

KAYAK, official number 556866
together with her engines,
machinery, components, anchors,
cables, chains, rigging, pumps,
gears, furnishings, appliances,
fittings, spare and replacement parts
and any and all other
appurtenances thereto,
appertaining or belonging to the
vessel, etc. *in rem, et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 3:22-cv-00250-SLG-MMS

ORDER RE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

On August 2, 2024, Plaintiff JAG Alaska, Inc. filed a Notice of Dismissal of all *in personam* defendants. The matter was referred to Magistrate Judge Matthew M. Scoble. At Docket 49, Judge Scoble issued his Report and Recommendation, in which he recommended that in light of the Notice of Dismissal, this case be closed, each party to bear its own costs. No objections to the Report and Recommendation were filed.

The matter is now before this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). That statute provides that a district court “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in

part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge.”¹ A court is to “make a de novo determination of those portions of the magistrate judge’s report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.”² However, § 636(b)(1) does not “require district court review of a magistrate’s factual or legal conclusions, under a *de novo* or any other standard, when neither party objects to those findings.”³

The Magistrate Judge recommended that the Court close this case and that each party bear its own costs. The Court has reviewed the Report and Recommendation and agrees with its analysis. Accordingly, the Court adopts the Report and Recommendation, and IT IS ORDERED that the Clerk of Court shall close this case, with each party to bear its own costs.

DATED this 12th day of September 2024, at Anchorage, Alaska.

/s/ Sharon L. Gleason
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

¹ 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

² *Id.*

³ *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985); *see also United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003).